

MICHAEL F. HERTZ
Deputy Assistant Attorney General
JOSEPH H. HUNT
Director, Federal Programs Branch
VINCENT M. GARVEY
Deputy Branch Director
ANTHONY J. COPPOLINO
Special Litigation Counsel
tony.coppolino@usdoj.gov
U.S. Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
20 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Phone: (202) 514-4782
Fax: (202) 616-8460

Shayana Kadidal
Michael Ratner
CENTER FOR CONSTITUTIONAL
RIGHTS
666 Broadway, 7th Floor
New York, NY 10012-2317
(212) 614-6438
Email: kadidal@ccrjustice.org

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Attorneys for Defendants

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

IN RE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY)	No. M:06-cv-01791-VRW
TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS)	
LITIGATION)	JOINT STATUS REPORT
)	

This Document Relates Only To: <i>Center for Constitutional Rights, et al.</i> <i>v. Barack Obama, et al.</i> (07-cv-1115-VRW)	Chief Judge Vaughn R. Walker
--	------------------------------

By order dated January 20, 2010 (Dkt. 31), the Court directed the parties to submit a joint status report advising the court of the status of this case, what proceedings are necessary to resolve it, and proposing a tentative schedule for such proceedings, if applicable. By Order dated February 26, 2010 (Dkt. 34), the Court granted the parties until March 19, 2010 to submit this report.

The parties, through their undersigned counsel, hereby submit the following report

Joint Status Report
Center for Constitutional Rights, et al. v. Barack Obama, et al. (07-CV-1115-VRW) (M:06-CV-1791-VRW)

1 setting forth the background of this case and, as indicated, their respective positions on further
2 proceedings.

3 **BACKGROUND**

4 1. This action was originally filed on January 17, 2006, in the United States District
5 Court for the Southern District of New York. Plaintiffs' complaint alleges, *inter alia*, that
6 plaintiffs were subject to warrantless surveillance by the National Security Agency ("NSA")
7 under a program authorized by the President after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.
8 *See* Complaint (Dkt. 16-1).

9 2. In 2006, while the case was still before the Southern District of New York,
10 plaintiffs moved for partial summary judgment. *See* Dkt. 16. Also in 2006, the Government
11 Defendants moved to dismiss or, in the alternative, for summary judgment, based in part on an
12 assertion of the state secrets privilege by the Director of National Intelligence ("DNI"). *See* Dkt.
13 12. Judge Gerard Lynch of the Southern District of New York heard argument on these motions
14 on September 5, 2006.

15 3. In February 2007, this case was transferred to this Court by the Judicial Panel on
16 Multidistrict Litigation. *See* Dkt. 1. The parties thereafter submitted supplemental
17 memorandum describing their pending motions. *See* Dkts. 3, 13, 14. This Court heard oral
18 argument on the pending motions on August 9, 2007. *See* Dkt. 20.

19 4. On August 10, 2007, plaintiffs moved to supplement their original complaint (*see*
20 Dkt. 19) to challenge provisions of the Protect America Act of 2007. The Government
21 Defendants opposed that motion to supplement and continued to seek dismissal of this action.
22 *See* Dkt. 22.

23 5. By order dated March 31, 2008, the Court terminated plaintiffs' motion to
24 supplement with leave to petition to renew if the circumstances warranted. *See* Dkt. 438 (MDL-
25 06-cv-1791-VRW). No further action has occurred in this case since that time.

1 **1. Plaintiffs' Position on Further Proceedings**

2 Plaintiffs' original complaint in this matter includes the following prayers for relief:

3 (b.) Order that Defendants disclose to Plaintiffs all unlawful surveillance of
4 Plaintiffs' communications carried out pursuant to the program;

5 (c.) Order that all Defendants turn over to Plaintiffs all information and records
6 in their possession relating to Plaintiffs that were acquired through the warrantless
surveillance program or were the fruit of surveillance under the program, and
subsequently destroy any such information and records in Defendants' possession;

7 Even assuming the NSA Program challenged in Plaintiffs' original summary judgment papers¹
8 is no longer in active operation with respect to continuing interception of communications, the
9 relief set forth above is necessary to remedy the harms set forth in Plaintiffs' summary judgment
10 papers. *See, e.g.*, Memorandum in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment,
11 Dkt. 16-1 (Dkt. 6 in Civil Action No. 06-313 (S.D.N.Y. March 9, 2006)) at 10-11 (describing
12 professional imperative upon Plaintiffs in this case to "evaluate whether confidences may have
13 been breached by Defendants' illegal surveillance and whether measures ought to be taken in
14 response"); Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, Dkt. 16-5 (Dkt. 56 in Civil
15 Action No. 06-313 (S.D.N.Y. Jun. 30, 2006)) at 4-13 (further describing harms); Affirmation of
16 Prof. Steven Gillers, Dkt. 16-6 (Jun. 27, 2006) at 10 ("Intercepted communications may be
17 exploited to the disadvantage of clients with no one the wiser. ... [W]hether intercepted
18 communications are or are not ever used to the disadvantage of a client or otherwise is irrelevant.
19 CCR has a duty to protect its clients' secrets and confidences regardless of the use to which an
20 interceptor may put the information. It is disclosure itself that is the evil against which lawyers
21 must protect clients, regardless of any additional consequences of the disclosure"); Supplemental
22 Affirmation of William Goodman, Dkt. 16-7 (June 30, 2006) at 10 (describing court order in
23 *Turkmen v. Ashcroft*, No. 02-CV-2307, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 40675 (E.D.N.Y. May 30, 2006),
24

25 ¹ This Court has not ruled on the parties' summary judgment motions, which are
26 described *supra* at ¶¶ 2-3.
27

1 compelling government's trial defense team and likely witnesses to disclose whether they had
2 access to surveillance of attorney-client communications in that case).

3 This Court should therefore resolve the question of Plaintiffs' entitlement to such relief,
4 and whatever additional relief the Court may find necessary to remedy the harms to Plaintiffs, on
5 a renewed motion for summary judgment.

6 Given the Government's position, set forth below, that Plaintiffs' claims should be
7 dismissed for lack of standing, Plaintiffs have no objection to proceeding by means of
8 cross-summary judgment filings by the parties. That process was followed at earlier stages of
9 this case and is consistent with the process the Court is currently following in *Al-Haramain*
10 *Islamic Foundation, Inc. v. Obama* (C07-CV-109). Plaintiffs also do not object to the
11 Government filing the initial brief, as long as the cross-motion schedule includes opportunity for
12 a cross-reply brief by Plaintiffs. With the addition of a cross-reply, the timeline proposed by the
13 Government for briefing is acceptable to Plaintiffs.

14 **2. The Government Defendants' Position on Further Proceedings**

15 Plaintiffs have alleged that they were subject to warrantless electronic surveillance under
16 the so-called "Terrorist Surveillance Program" ("TSP"), pursuant to which the National Security
17 Agency ("NSA") was authorized by then-President Bush after the 9/11 attacks to intercept
18 certain international communications to or from the United States reasonably believed to involve
19 a member or agent of al Qaeda or affiliated terrorist organizations. *See* Compl. (Dkt. 16-1)
20 ¶¶ 26-27. Plaintiffs allege that, because clients they represent were accused of having terrorist
21 connections, their communications may have been subject to interception under the TSP and that
22 plaintiffs took steps to avoid such alleged surveillance. *See id.* ¶¶ 35-44. Based on that
23 allegation of injury, plaintiffs originally sought to challenge the lawfulness of the TSP on
24 statutory and constitutional grounds, and sought declaratory and injunctive relief—including as
25 plaintiffs note for the disclosure and destruction of any records related to the alleged
26 surveillance. *See id.* ¶¶ 45-52 & Prayer for Relief. In January 2007, the Government advised the
27

1 Court that any electronic surveillance that had been occurring pursuant to the TSP had been
2 supplanted by orders of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court and that the TSP was not
3 reauthorized thereafter. *See* Dkt. 127-1 in M:06-cv-1791-VRW.

4 As set forth above, Plaintiffs now seek to resume proceedings in this case by pressing one
5 of their original claims—for the disclosure and expunction of any records that may exist of
6 alleged surveillance of Plaintiffs under the now defunct Terrorist Surveillance Program.

7 From the outset of this case, the Government Defendants have sought dismissal on
8 several grounds, including that Plaintiffs' allegations of injury are insufficient to establish their
9 Article III standing. As we have previously set forth for the Court, Plaintiffs' allegation of TSP
10 surveillance—and, thus, their allegation that documents purportedly exist of such alleged
11 surveillance—has been and remains purely conjectural and insufficient to establish their
12 standing. *See, e.g.*, Defendants' Supplemental Memorandum in Support of Motion to Dismiss or
13 for Summary Judgment (Dkt. 3) at 12-15 and Defendants' Supplemental Reply Memorandum
14 (Dkt. 14) at 6-17. Much like the *Jewel* and *Shubert* actions recently dismissed by the Court on
15 January 21, 2010 (*see* Dkt. 703 in M:06-cv-1791-VRW), this case should also be dismissed for
16 lack of standing based on the insufficiency of the Plaintiffs' allegations of injury. Accordingly,
17 the Government will renew its motion to dismiss for lack of standing.

18 The Government's prior dispositive motion also sought summary judgment in the
19 alternative based on an assertion of the state secrets privilege and related statutory privileges by
20 the DNI over, *inter alia*, whether or not the Plaintiffs in fact have been subject to the alleged TSP
21 surveillance. *See* Defs. Supp. Mem. (Dkt. 3) at 20-21; Defs. Supp. Reply (Dkt. 14) at 18-20. As
22 in the *Jewel* and *Shubert* actions, the Government contends that the DNI's privilege assertion
23 forecloses the disclosure of any evidence necessary to litigate Plaintiffs' standing and the merits
24 of their remaining document claim, including any information that would tend to confirm or
25 deny whether or not plaintiffs were subject to the alleged TSP surveillance and whether or not
26 any documents concerning such alleged surveillance exist. Thus, even if the Court were inclined
27

1 to find that Plaintiffs have alleged sufficient injury to proceed past the pleading stage, Plaintiffs'
 2 standing or the merits of their claims could not otherwise be litigated without risking or requiring
 3 the disclosure of privileged information.² However, in light of the Court's dismissal of *Jewel*
 4 and *Shubert* without reaching the state secrets privilege issue, the Court can and should likewise
 5 dismiss this case for lack of standing again without reaching the impact of the Government's
 6 privilege assertion.

7 With respect to the sequence of further proceedings, the parties agree generally on a
 8 schedule (*see* Part 3 *infra*), but differ on whether the Court should now consider cross-motions.
 9 Government submits that the proper course would be for the Court to consider its dispositive
 10 motion before consideration of summary judgment on the merits of the Plaintiffs' last remaining
 11 document claim. Plaintiffs' document claim is premised on their original allegation that they
 12 were subject to and injured by the TSP. The insufficiency of that allegation to establish standing
 13 impacts all claims—including the claim that documents of such alleged surveillance exist—and
 14 thus is properly subject to a motion to dismiss. Likewise, because the underlying facts needed to
 15 address plaintiffs' standing and claim on the merits at the summary judgment stage are subject to
 16 the Government's privilege assertion, the Government could not respond otherwise to Plaintiffs'
 17 summary judgment motion until after the issues raised by the Government's motion are resolved.
 18 The process proposed by the Government would be consistent with the process followed by the
 19 Court in the *Shubert* action. *See* Dkt. 31 in 07-cv-00693-VRW (minute order following case
 20 management conference in *Shubert* setting schedule on Government's dispositive motion). The
 21

22 ² The Government notes that, in a FOIA action seeking information essentially identical
 23 to that at issue in this privilege assertion—whether attorneys for CCR have been subject to
 24 alleged surveillance—the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit recently upheld the
 25 Government's refusal to confirm or deny that information. *Wilner, et al. v. National Security*
 26 *Agency*, 592 F.3d 60 (2d Cir. 2009). The Government reserves for our motion discussion of
 27 whether plaintiffs have stated a valid cause of action to compel the disclosure of records
 28 allegedly held by the Government or which would authorize the destruction of any such records.

status of this case is not comparable to the lengthy proceedings that have arisen in the *Al-Haramain* action and led to the Court's consideration of cross-summary judgment motions in that case.

3. Proposed Schedule

With the exception of whether cross-motions should be filed (discussed above), the parties agree generally on a schedule for further proceedings.

The Government Defendants propose the following schedule: (i) that the Government Defendants renew their dispositive motion by no later than April 28, 2010; (ii) that Plaintiffs filed an opposition to that motion by May 28, 2010; (iii) that the Government Defendants reply by June 18, 2010; and (iv) that the Court determine if and when it wishes to set the matter for a hearing thereafter.

As noted above, the Plaintiffs do not object to this schedule with the addition of a cross-reply in connection with their own summary judgment motion.

Respectfully Submitted,

<u><i>For Government Defendants' Position</i></u>	<u><i>For Plaintiffs' Position</i></u>
MICHAEL F. HERTZ Deputy Assistant Attorney General JOSEPH H. HUNT Director, Federal Programs Branch VINCENT M. GARVEY Deputy Branch Director ANTHONY J. COPPOLINO Special Litigation Counsel tony.coppolino@usdoj.gov U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Division20 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001 Phone: (202) 514-4782 By: <u>s/ Anthony J. Coppolino</u> ANTHONY J. COPPOLINO Attorneys for Defendants	Shayana Kadidal Michael Ratner CENTER FOR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS 666 Broadway, 7th Floor New York, NY 10012-2317 (212) 614-6438 Email: kadidal@ccrjustice.org By: <u>s/ Shayana Kadidal</u> SHAYANA KADIDAL Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Joint Status Report

Center for Constitutional Rights, et al. v. Barack Obama, et al. (07-CV-1115-VRW) (M:06-CV-1791-VRW)

DECLARATION PURSUANT TO GENERAL ORDER 45, § X.B

I, ANTHONY J. COPPOLINO, hereby declare pursuant to General Order 45, § X.B, that I have obtained the concurrence in the filing of this document from the other signatory listed below.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing declaration is true and correct.

Executed on March 19, 2010, in the City of Washington, D.C.

By: s/ Anthony J. Coppolino
ANTHONY J. COPPOLINO
Special Litigation Counsel
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Rm. 6102
Washington, D.C. 20001
Phone: (202) 514-4782-Fax: (202) 616-8460
Email: tony.coppolino@usdoj.gov

Attorney for Defendants

By : s/Shayana Kadidal per G.O. 45
Shayana Kadidal
Michael Ratner
CENTER FOR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS
666 Broadway, 7th Floor
New York, NY 10012-2317
(212) 614-6438
Email: kadidal@ccrjustice.org

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Joint Status Report

Center for Constitutional Rights, et al. v. Barack Obama, et al. (07-CV-1115-VRW) (M:06-CV-1791-VRW)